MR. T. KUMARA PILLAI:

90. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 20,900 for Legislative Council by Rs. 100.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH:

91. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 20,900 for Legislative Council by Rs. 100.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI:

92. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 18,500 for Sri Mulam Popular Assembly by Rs. 100.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH:

93. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,548 for Director of Office Systems by Rs. 100.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH:

94. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,050 for Special Officer to deal with the question of delegation of administrative powers in various departments by Rs. 100.

MR. T. J. MATHEW:

95. To omit the allotment of Rs. 2,050 for Special Officer to deal with the question of delegation of administrative powers in various departments.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI:

96. To omit the allotment of Rs. 2,050 for Establishment, etc., of Special Officer to deal with the delegation of administrative powers in various departments.

MR G. RAMAN MENON:

97. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 2·12 lakhs under Demand VII by Rs. 100.

MR. K. K. THOMAS:

98. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 2·12 lakhs under Demand VII by Rs. 100.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH:

99. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 2·12 lakhs under Demand VII by Rs. 100.

MR. K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI:

100. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 2·12 lakhs under Demand VII by Rs. 100.

PRESIDENT: The time for this Demand has expired, and I now put to the vote of the House the Demand under General Administration,—Huzur Cutcherry, for Rs. 2·12 lakhs *minus* Rs. 1,000 and I take it that the demand is granted.

The motion was carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND VIII—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—ACCOUNT OFFICE.

MR. K. GEORGE (*Financial Secretary to Government*): Sir, I move for a grant not exceeding Rs. ·95 lakh under Demand VIII—Account Office.

Motions 101.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara cum Kartikapalli*): Sir, I beg to move for a reduction of Rs. 900 from the allotment for second class clerks and for the reasons explained before, I shall withdraw the motion. But before doing so, I should like to say a few words about efficiency. The large number of hands —

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. K. GEORGE (*Financial Secretary to Government*): Is he in order in speaking of efficiency when he moves for a reduction of clerks?

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara* cum *Kartikapalli*): My proposal is for a reduction of hands.

PRESIDENT: When you move for a reduction of a demand by a specific motion, you cannot talk upon the question of policy, as though it were a token motion.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara* cum *Kartikapalli*): Of course, the Government can very well reduce a few hands. I have asked only for a reduction of one hand.

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, North*): I rise to a point of order. Is the member withdrawing the motion? If so, he cannot make a speech.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara* cum *Kartikapalli*): I shall withdraw it after making a speech.

PRESIDENT: I think you said you have withdrawn it.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara* cum *Kartikapalli*): Yes, I withdraw.

PRESIDENT: Am I to understand that you are not moving the reduction?

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara* cum *Kartikapalli*): It is not necessary to have a large number of hands for securing efficiency. But, as ultimately I mean to withdraw the motion, I do not think I need spend any time over this motion.

The following motion was therefore regarded as not moved:

101. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 11,974 for Second Class clerks by Rs. 900.

Motions 102.

MR. M. SUBRAHMANYA PILLAI (*Agastisvaram*): I beg to move the following motion:

102. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 85,157 for establishment by Rs. 240.

The Budget provides for a local allowance of Rs. 20 per mensem to the Manager of the General Section of the Account Office. First of all, I have to point out that there is no such sanctioned appointment for the Account Office. The name 'Manager' is a new one that has crept into the Budget Estimate for the first time, and I am led to believe that the term anticipates the creation of a new appointment. Perhaps, at present, it is only a clerk of the Department in charge of the General Section. The proposed duty allowance will just give him a lift from the rank of clerks and the grant of duty allowance coupled with the change of name will, I believe, end in the creation of a new appointment between clerks and Superintendents in the office. I object to this purely on principle. I have said at the time of the general discussion of the budget that so soon as the arrangements made in accordance with the recommendations of the Salaries Committee and the Efficiency

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. M. Subrahmanya Pillai]

Audit Officer are given effect to, this House should as far as possible avoid increasing expenditure on account of establishment in the higher ranks of the several departments. The duty allowance now proposed to be allowed is a permanent attachment to the post, and sooner or later another proposal may be brought forward to add the same to the pay of the so-called Manager making the whole amount pensionable. I am actuated to bring forward this motion purely on principle, which I presume has more or less been accepted by this side of the House. I hope the Account Officer will find it possible to accept this cut and set an example to other heads of departments and make them more cautious hereafter in bringing forward proposals either for enhancement of the existing salaries or in creating new appointments.

MR. K. GEORGE (*Financial Secretary to Government*): Sir, I have proposed a duty allowance of Rs. 20 to the clerk who is in charge of the General Section in my office merely as a matter of justice. Mr. Subrahmanya Pillai said that it is a new name. No doubt, officially it is a new name. But from the very inception of the Account Offfce, several years ago, it had an officer in charge of the Section, and he is by courtesy called Manager. That designation has not been put in newly, and it does not appear in the official budget as the post of a Manager, because there is no such post. There are nine Sections in the Account Office, 8 of which are controlled by persons designated Superintendents, and this Section, called the General Section, has as its head, a clerk and he is called Manager. This Manager, as I said, is only a clerk. The duties of the Section of which he is in charge I shall briefly enumerate. The General Section deals chiefly with the following items of work.—

1. Receipt of letters, half margin and other communications from other departments. I may say that they number about 75,000. This year up-to-date, the number is 75,700.

2. Registration of all received correspondence in sectional registers and their distribution to the various sections of the office.

3. Receipt and accounting of money and valuables. Under this item we have 700 valuables, besides Government Debenture Bonds which were received in the office for conversion into Government Promissory Notes numbering about 1,500.

4. Typing of out-going letters.

5. Registration and despatch of all out-going communications, *viz.*, letters, half-margin, etc., numbering up-to-date 50,360 and account work relating to office, *viz.*, keeping account of contingent expenditure and travelling allowance of establishment, maintenance of service books numbering 167, preparation of acquittance rolls, verification of leave of the members of the office, etc.

6. The receipt and issue of stationery to the officers and 8 Superintendents and 100 clerks and keeping of accounts of stationery and printed forms.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

7. The custody of old records and issuing them on requisition from the several sections of the office, and other duties of a miscellaneous character in office, such as the control of the menial establishment, maintenance of furniture accounts, attending to the superior gazetted staff and various other minor duties.

The Section consists of 14 clerks, and the senior clerk is in charge of it, and he, as I said before, is called the Manager, by courtesy. It will be seen from what I have said that the section has a variety of important and responsible duties to perform.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): May I know from what year such duties devolved upon the Manager?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Financial Secretary to Government*): From the very beginning, these duties were there. At any rate, I remember these duties were given to the Manager from the time of the reorganisation in 1086. With the state of things before that, I am not conversant. As at present constituted, the section is solely managed by a clerk while other sections are controlled by Superintendents. The clerk is treated as one in the general line only. In other sections, clerks have only the ordinary duties of clerks. In all other sections, they have audit work or compilation work or things like that. They have no control or management of other clerks. The Manager, although he attends to such a large volume of duties, is not getting any remuneration for the work which entails on him.

MR. M. N. PILLAI (*Trivandrum*): May I know what his pay is?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Financial Secretary to Government*): Rs. 75-100.

MR. K. MADHAVAN PILLAI (*Trivandrum* cum *Neduvangad*): Is he not liable to promotion or is he a fixture?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Financial Secretary to Government*): The question is not that. He must be given something for the extra work which other clerks do not ordinarily get. He is not doing the work of a clerk. So promotion in the clerical line is not what I propose. Properly speaking, the General Section also should be under a Superintendent like other sections in the office. The same was the practice in Madras while I was there, that is, to have a Superintendent or an Assistant Superintendent in charge of the section. The Central Issue Branch in the Secretariat has got a Manager who gets Rs. 125-150. I also suggested to the Government the creation of a corresponding post in my office. The work of the Central Issue Branch, if I may say so, is of issue only. There is no account work. There is no keeping of records. These things are done in separate sections in the Secretariat. However, later on I thought that it would be too expensive for Government to create a new post. So I suggested the granting of Rs. 20 as duty allowance, purely as a matter of justice to the individual who happens to be in charge of the General Section.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. T. J. MATTHEW (*Changanachery* cum *Peermade*): How many years' service has he put in?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Financial Secretary to Government*): I do not speak of any particular individual. The particular individual now in charge of the section may, I believe, have put in thirty years' service. Whoever be in charge of the section must be given that allowance, because the work that is done is not that of a clerk. He has to control about 13 clerks. He is doing the work which in other sections is done by a Superintendent. These are the reasons for my recommendations. And I hope that justice requires that he must be paid this allowance.

MR. M. N. PILLAI (*Trivandrum*): Cannot the section be put in charge of a Superintendent?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Financial Secretary to Government*): If the House will give me a Superintendent, I can.

MR. M. N. PILLAI (*Trivandrum*): Not additional Superintendent.

MR. K. GEORGE (*Financial Secretary to Government*): We have eight Superintendents each of whom is in charge of a section, independent of the General Section. If this section is to be put in charge of one of the Superintendents, that would be dislocating the work in other Sections. I hope this House will permit this small remuneration being given, purely, as a matter of justice, to the hard working Manager.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): I am very sorry I have to oppose the grant. After listening to the explanation given by Mr. George, the case for removing this particular item from the Budget has become stronger. For, it is a question of principle that is involved here. Mr. George finds a particular clerk, or a manager as he is courteously called, deserving of some encouragement by way of a local allowance. There may be clerks of this description or officers of this description in other departments. Mr. George thinks that the man who works under him stands in need of a further stimulus in the shape of a local allowance. What about other persons who are equally hard working in other departments? They do not move Government for any local allowance. Apparently, an invidious distinction has been created in favour of one person. It may be that he deserves it. But the principle is indefensible. It has been pointed out that the clerk is a very hard-working man and as such he stands in need of encouragement. I fear, Sir, if he is hard working, the attempt ought to be to relieve him from a portion of his duties. Compensation by way of money will not take away the hard nature of the work that he has to attend to. (*Laughter*). If Government are solicitous about the longevity of their servants, I certainly would agree with Mr. George in thinking that relief should be given to them. To ask a man to do an amount of work which he under normal circumstances cannot get through, cannot be balanced by payment of rupees, annas and pies. That, therefore, discloses an indefensible principle. If the work in the office of Mr. George now attended to by this

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

particular manager is out of proportion, Mr. George certainly could request this Council to provide other hands and take away a portion of the work of the present incumbent. I can understand that. On the other hand, if it is a case of a deserving person standing in need of further encouragement, I admit, he ought to be promoted to a higher office. It would be fair if Mr. George asks for any increase in the salary for the post, instead of for the individual who is now doing the duties.

MR. K. GEORGE (*Financial Secretary to Government*): That was what I was all along saying. The allowance is not for the person, but for the post.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*) : That is true. That is a principle which applies to the several offices in the whole State but not only for this particular post. A gradation has been introduced with respect to the several posts, not only in the Account Office but also in the other departments of the State. After creating a gradation of these posts, to say that a particular individual, because he is hard-worked should be given an artificial support by way of local allowance is, I beg to submit, not correct. If it is the case of a deserving man, Mr. George is at liberty to put him on a higer post carrying with it better emoluments proportionate to the merits of the individual.

MR. K. GEORGE (*Financial Secretary to Government*): May I correct him ? There is no post of Manager now ; the work is being done by a clerk.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*) : Very good. Probably he provided for a clerk. Ultimately he found, in the exigencies of his office, that there was necessity for a Manager. The man in question is only a clerk in his external relations but is a Manager in the circle of Mr. George's office. Mr. George has artificially created the appointment and now he wants to add another artificiality by way of local allowance. This he considers justice pure and simple. If there is necessity for a man, why not Mr. George say plainly that he stands in need of a Manager as was done by Mr. Van Ross the other day (*Laughter*) and get a manager appointed, by convincing the House of the real necessity for the post ? That ought to be his move. The present demand for local allowance cannot be supported on principle, especially as it comes from Mr. George, the Financial Secretary to Government, who is at the centre of the State commanding all the finances of the State. All other officers in the State may also think that some of their clerks, for the time being are hard-worked and that they also deserve local allowance. They may also call such clerks as Managers by courtesy, and say that they are really clerks doing extra work. This will be setting a bad precedent, as I said, coming as it does especially from Mr. George. Therefore, I am submitting, Sir, whatever be the merit of the claim, the method adopted by Mr. George should not be this. If Mr. George is prepared to convince the House of the need for a Manager, by all means let him ask for it. Let not this artificiality be adopted to keep up a person in the guise of a Manager. Further I do

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai.]

not know exactly when this local allowance came into existence. There is one thing; Mr. George has admitted that from 1086 onwards, these duties are being attended to by one of the clerks who, though not officially called Manager, is courteously called so. In all these previous years, my recollection is, he did not stand in need of this encouragement This has been thought of, I suppose, only recently. That is another point to be taken into consideration. I suppose the present incumbent was not doing these duties in earlier years. He came in, probably, only subsequently. There were other persons who were doing all these duties in the past and they were denied this encouragement by way of local allowance. They were denied this artificial assistance. When the matter for this encouragement was considered, the claims of the present incumbent alone were attractive in the mind of Mr. George. Sir, I fail to appreciate all these considerations and I am at one with Mr. Subrahmanya Pillai in thinking that this amount will have to be cut out.

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, North*): Sir, Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai says that, on principle, he objects to duty allowance being given to the clerk in the Account Office. I should like to point out that the practice of giving duty allowance is not absolutely new, as he seems to think. In the case of Vernacular Schools, I think, there is a general practice to give duty allowance to those teachers who are put in charge of schools.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): May I know whether it is a widespread practice?

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, North*): I think it is more or less widespread in the case of all Vernacular Schools. That is one instance which I know. There may be other instances also. Therefore, what I want to submit to the House is that it is not absolutely unique or unjustifiable for a person being given duty allowance for particular reasons. To say that we should go merely and absolutely on principle and should not pay any attention to the equity of the circumstances is not, to my mind, a very convincing argument. Of course, all these considerations should be combined together in arriving at a decision. Mr. George has pointedly referred to the fact that it is not a personal matter and that it is an allowance attached to the office. Of course, it is said that he should have put the section in charge of a Superintendent or some other higher officer. If the House is of opinion that that should be done, I am sure the Financial Secretary will not have the least objection to that being done. But, for considerations of economy and at the same time for meeting the claims of justice, he has proposed a measure, which, I think the House should accept, coming especially as it does from the present Account Officer, who, the House will admit, has been very very careful in extracting the full worth of the money that is given out to the officers of his department.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): May I know whether he is arguing for himself or on behalf of the House?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, North*) : Is he now speaking for himself or for the House ? I am also speaking in the same manner. I do not think it needs any other reply.

MR. G. RAMAN MENON (*Mavelikara* cum *Kartikapalli*) : Is Mr. Mammen Mappillai aware that local allowances are being given to four others also ?

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, North*) : That may be ; but that does not arise in the present instance.

The Account Officer has made it quite clear that the duties, discharged by the incumbent referred to, are not the duties discharged by the ordinary clerks, that the work is sufficiently comprehensive and many-sided, that in the other sections the duties are being discharged by officers of higher status, and that, in the present case, the incumbent is an officer who has been serving in the department for very nearly 30 years.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*) : So, this is a question of the present incumbent.

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, North*) : Moreover, if you say that, in the past this allowance was not given, I say, it is now all the more reasonable that it should be given. But, I should like to say, there are anomalies in all departments, and when they come prominently to the notice of the heads of departments, it is their duty to see that some justice is meted out.

Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai said that there may be several persons who may not be in a position to bring their claims to the notice of Government. What I would submit is. that it is not this particular clerk alone that has got access to Government through the head of the department. Every other clerk, in every other department, has the same access through the head of the respective department. Therefore, there is no invidious advantage enjoyed by this particular clerk. Other clerks also enjoy the same access, and when their claims are brought forward, I am sure, they will be scrutinised very carefully by the head of the administration. I may also say that there is the Finance Committee where also they will be very closely scrutinised, before they are brought to this House. Having heard all that the Financial Secretary has said just now, and also his elaborate arguments in the Finance Committee, I am strongly of opinion that this recommendation of the Account Officer should be accepted by the House.

MR. M. SUBRAHMANYA PILLAI (*Agastisvaram*) : Sir, In moving this motion, I simply wanted to point out to Government a certain principle which I thought this side of the House has already accepted. From the speeches made by some of my friends, I do not think a majority on this side of the House accept the principle. Under these circumstances, I do not want to press the motion.

The motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Motion 103.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*) : Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

103. To omit the allotment of Rs. 628—

PRESIDENT: I think you will have to exclude Rs. 240 from your motion.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*) : The previous motion which proposed a reduction of Rs. 240 was not subjected to the vote of the House. It was withdrawn by the member. I had absolutely no control over that member to make him press it to a division. It is now my turn and I think I am at liberty to make the motion as it is.

PRESIDENT : You could have objected to the withdrawal.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara*) : May I point out Sir, that in arranging these motions, motions for reducing larger sums should come before proposals for smaller cuts? This has not been done.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): If that is done and if larger cuts are out-voted, there would be no necessity for moving the proposals for smaller cuts. If my motion had been voted upon, there would have been no necessity for moving Mr. Subrahmanya Pillai's motion.

I therefore beg to make the following motion :—

103. To omit the allotment of Rs. 628 for local allowances.

As will be seen from page 62 of the Preliminary Budget, this amount consists of a local allowance of Rs. 240—this is the first year it is being introduced—for a clerk, two allowances at the rate of Rs. 10 each and another two at the rate of Rs. 7 each. On the whole, the figure comes up to Rs. 628.

Sir, I have practically exhausted my reasons while speaking on Mr. Subrahmanya Pillai's motion. I have only to reply to certain observations of Mr. Mammen Mappillai. Mr. Mammen Mappillai pointed out the existence of local allowances in the case of the Headmasters of Vernacular Schools. I asked Mr. Mammen Mappillai whether it was a widespread practice. He said 'It might be'. That, I thought, was not any answer to my question. The case of the vernacular school headmasters and teachers, and the economy adopted by the Education department in their case, have been discussed in this House to a considerable extent, so much so, when the educational budget comes up before the House, it will be time enough for the House to indicate the injustice that is being done to the teachers of the vernacular schools. The cry on the part of members on this side of this House, so far as the teachers of the vernacular schools are concerned, has been that the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

pay and prospects of the vernacular school teachers should be enhanced. The Education Department has been economising too much in that direction. Mr. Hodgson observed on one occasion, "If you want cheap education, all that is possible is what is being done at present in regard to these vernacular schools". So, the case of the headmasters and teachers of the vernacular schools cannot be taken as a model to regulate our conduct with respect to other institutions. Keeping that instance apart, it may be seen that the principle is newly inaugurated by Mr. George in the Account Office. As I submitted while speaking on the last motion, I have considerable dislike for it. If it is a case of actual justice being done, this is not the method to approach it. By all means, increase the pay. Mr. George is at liberty to do that. He seems to say that he did not want to do so in the interest of the tax-payer's money. That ought not to be done. The State after all need not be driven to such extremities. I object to this, as a matter of principle. I have got very great dislike for such things. It will be setting a bad precedent, especially if it originates from one like Mr. George, from whom I expect considerable adherence to principles. Mr. Mammen Mappillai said that principle is not the only thing to be looked to in these matters, and that there are various other considerations. I say the question, as to what these various other considerations are, is not clear and even that must be regulated by some principle. So, I am submitting, I do not find any reason to agree with Mr. George in the matter of these local allowances. In the Huzur Office, I do not find anything like local allowance. There also work is being carried on by clerks. Why the clerk of the Account Office alone should be shown that special consideration, I am not in a position to understand. I fail to appreciate the logic underlying it. Hence, I move for the reduction.

MR. K. GEORGE (*Financial Secretary to Government*): In this motion of Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai there is not only the question of the local allowance of the Manager of the Account Office, but there are also four other local allowances.

As regards the local allowance of the Manager, I thought I had explained sufficiently clearly that the allowance is proposed to be given because the Manager is in charge of a section, unlike other sections which are managed by Superintendents. Under this Manager there are 13 clerks. That was the reason why I said he was not an ordinary clerk and that he should be treated otherwise.

As regards the question of principle, I may say that my friend Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai is not quite correct when he says that this is not correct in principle. I believe, in many other departments, whenever men from the general cadre are asked to do special work, they are given duty allowances. The Inspector of Police doing the duties of Manager in the Office of the Commissioner of Police gets an allowance. The Sub-Registrar doing the duties of Manager in the Office of the Director of Registration gets duty allowance. Similar duty allowances are given in many other cases where a man in a general cadre is posted to do special work. Therefore, on the question

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. K. George.]

of principle, I do not think I am going out of the way. I do not want to speak anything more on that point. I urge that matter on the attention of the House on principle as well as on equity.

As regards other local allowances, there are two rates of allowances, one of ten rupees each for two persons and the other of seven rupees for two persons. These allowances are paid to the clerks working on inspection duty in the town.

Sir, there are 67 institutions in the town which are under local audit. They are scattered far apart. There are institutions at Poojapurai, at Pangode, Vazhuthacad, Ulloor, Karamanai and Oolamparai and various places where these auditors have to go. It will be conceded by the House that they have to go a long way from the office to do their work.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Are they not being given travelling allowance?

MR. K. GEORGE (*Financial Secretary to Government*): No. As the distance is within a radius of five miles, no allowance can be given. These clerks have to go a long way and in various directions. It is only proper on the part of Government to give them conveyance allowance. But it was found that the conveyance hire came from Rs. 15 to Rs. 20 per month. With a view to economise and to make the payment a regular one, this provision has been made. The Auditors are going round the institutions in the town all round the year so that no time of theirs is spent in the Account Office. The senior clerks get Rs. 10 each and the junior men get each Rs. 7. If carriage hire is given, it will come to something like Rs. 750 a year; so this local allowance has been given to them. If we take away the local allowance, it will be a great hardship to them; so I submit the whole allotment which I have proposed may be sanctioned by the House.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Sir, as I submitted, the motion is made up of two figures, *i. e.*, Rs. 220 for local allowance to the Manager and the rest for the local allowance of the clerks who are sent about on inspection duty. After the explanation of Mr. George relating to these persons who are sent out on inspection duty, I do not want to press the motion as regards them. Only with respect to the payment of local allowance to the Manager, I press the motion to a division.

MR. N. V. JOSEPH (*Parur*): I have a difficulty. Sir, under Standing Order 22, a motion must not raise a question substantially identical with the one on which the Council has given a decision.

PRESIDENT: No decision was given, as the motion was withdrawn.

MR. N. V. JOSEPH (*Parur*): In that case, that motion was allowed by the House to be withdrawn. So, if that motion was worthy of consideration by the House and put to vote, the House ought to have

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

voted upon. Mr. Subrahmanya Pillai himself had no right to withdraw and he only withdrew the same with the consent of the House. As the House has once sanctioned the withdrawal, I think it will be quite inconsistent.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara*): Sir, may I point out one thing before the President gives the ruling in regard to that point? It will be a very dangerous precedent if Mr. Joseph's suggestion is accepted. Mr. Subrahmanya Pillai wanted permission to withdraw the motion and that was allowed by the House. If a member asks for leave to withdraw a motion and if the House allows the same, it is only so far as to withdraw the motion that the House has given permission. If it is said that the House decided on its merits, I think it will be a very dangerous precedent.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Sir, I have been allowed to move it.

PRESIDENT: I share the opinion of Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai, that to withdraw a motion is a different thing from voting on a motion. The distinction is rather fine but I think it does exist. But, in regard to this motion itself, I understand Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai withdraws—

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Except that portion of the grant relating to the local allowance to the Manager, *i. e.*, Rs. 220.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): The proper way will be to amend the motion accordingly.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): The amended motion runs as follows:—

To omit the allotment of Rs. 220 out of Rs. 628 for local allowance.

PRESIDENT: Personally, I think the discussion, and possibly the academic interest in it, has attached more interest than the matter deserves and has invested it with principles that I fail to see and that have cast around it a halo of importance.

MR. CHANGANACHERY K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Quilon*): Standing Order 21 says, "Where substantially identical motions stand in the names of two or more members, the President shall decide whose motion shall be moved and the other motions shall thereupon be deemed to be withdrawn."

This is not an identical motion; but when it is split, the motions are identical. So Mr. Subrahmanya Pillai's motion having been allowed to be moved, the other motion of Mr. Narayana Pillai ought to have been allowed to be withdrawn, though subsequently he was allowed to add it on without splitting up.

PRESIDENT: We are getting into very fine distinctions.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara*): The President has allowed it to be moved.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

PRESIDENT: It has been allowed and I think the item can stand without our going into these subtle distinctions deeply. The thing has grown like a snow ball. It is a matter of a few rupees which a few clerks have been drawing and a few rupees for another clerk. I personally see nothing in the way of intrinsic importance. With these words, I will put the amended motion to the vote of the House.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Since the President does not observe any importance attached to the question, I am not very anxious that the motion should be pressed. Hence, it may be taken as withdrawn.

The motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

PRESIDENT: The question is that a sum of Rs. 95 lakh be granted under Demand VIII—General Administration—Account Office.

The Demand was sanctioned.

DEMAND IX.—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

PRESIDENT: We will now proceed with discussion on Demand IX-Administration of Justice.

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, North*): Sir, there are two elections to be conducted this evening. So I propose that we may adjourn now.

PRESIDENT: If the members wish that we adjourn for the election of members to the Committees, we can do so.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara*): There are 35 minutes more.

PRESIDENT: You may have 5 hours altogether.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara*): The difficulty will be that we may not reach all Demands. If the President will allow us to proceed later on and give us another 35 minutes in excess—

PRESIDENT: I shall give you an extra half-an-hour.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara*): If we can get half-an-hour more, it will be all right.

PRESIDENT: I will give your half-an-hour more on Monday. If you like, we may even meet at 11 A. M.

The Council adjourned at 4-29 P. M. to meet again at 11-30 A. M. on Monday, the 10th August 1925.

T. P. RAMASUBBA AIYAR,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly